

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/728,325	Applicant(s) SOSNOSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Ryan Hsu	Art Unit 3714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ryan Hsu.

(3) Michael Blankstein.

(2) John Hotaling.

(4) Jim Salter and Alexander Vodovozov.

Date of Interview: 26 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wachi and Takahashi et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JOHN M. HOTALING, II
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative discussed the proposed claim amendments that incorporated the limitation "a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel" as overcoming the prior art of record. As argued by the applicant's representative the previous pieces of prior art grounded the panel mounted in front of a display using clasp as taught in Takahashi or a metal strip as taught in Wachi. According to the applicant's representative both references lacked in teaching this method of grounding by bezel which according to the applicant's representative provided such improvements as eliminating a step in manufacturing or reducing the need for a costly metal strip. The Examiner stated that these arguments would be fully considered when the formal response was received, but did offer the position that this different method of grounding did not necessarily offer an unexpected result and may have been a simple matter of design choice. It was agreed that a further search would be completed on the proposed claims at the time the official response was entered but no agreement towards the patentability of the claims could be made at this time.



JOHN M. HOTALING, II
PRIMARY EXAMINER